

Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000
Public Law 106-393
Title II Project Submission Form
Northeast Oregon Forests Resource Advisory
Committee

1. Project Number (Assigned by Designated Federal Official) **GR-MAL04-100**

2. Project Name: Malheur North End Noxious Weed Treatment	3. County: Grant
4. Project Sponsor: Blue Mountain and Prairie City Ranger Districts	5. Date: December 9, 2002
6. Sponsor's Phone Number: Mike Montgomery (541)575-3401 Ryan Falk (541)820-3801	
7. Sponsors E-mail: mmontgomery02@fs.fed.us and rjalk@fs.fed.us Project contact: Sue Burton (541)575-3460	

8. Project Location: District-Wide	
a. 4 th Field Watershed Name and HUC #: Upper John Day 17070201, Middle Fork John Day 17070203, Harney Malheur Lakes 17120001, North Fork John Day 17070202, Silvies 17120002, Upper Malheur 17050116	
b. 5 th Field Watershed Name and HUC #.	
c. Location: All townships and ranges within the boundaries of the Blue Mountain and Prairie City Ranger Districts.	
d. BLM District	e. BLM Resource Area
f. National Forest: Malheur	g. Forest Service District: Blue Mountain, Prairie City
h. State / Private / Other lands involved? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

9. Statement of Project Goals and Objectives: (max. 7 lines) To control the spread and eradicate noxious weeds over time on the forest. Confine or reduce present populations of noxious weeds to current locations. Treat all known weed sites annually until eradicated. Treat all newly reported noxious weed sites promptly and aggressively.

10. Project Description: (max. 30 lines.) Treat weeds sites identified in the forest weed database in a systematic approach based on seed production and dispersal of the species. Weed species are defined using the Grant County Weed List; over 1500 sites (most currently small, less than 0.1 acres) have been identified on the Blue Mountain and Prairie City Ranger Districts. Knapweeds, white top, toadflax, and leafy spurge are some examples. The only method of control available to the Malheur National Forest for noxious weeds is manual treatment or possibly biological. Therefore, the methods to remove noxious weeds will be by grubbing or cutting with hand tools/weed eaters, twice during the growing season. Grubbing uses hand tools to cut stems or tap roots below the ground surface (1-2"). Cutting severs heads from the root above the ground level. Both are effective controls of targeted weed species, however may not be effective methods of eradication. At the time of proposal submission, chemical treatment is not an option, as the Forest has been enjoined through the court system. If chemical application is allowed in
--

2004, any chemical treatment done by the Forest will be conducted using other fund sources. If necessary, some treatment areas will be seeded with annual rye or native grass species if available. All weed sites are recorded in a forest/district database; individual site histories includes size of infestation, plant numbers and density, type of treatment implemented, follow-up treatments and effectiveness. Sites monitored since 1989 show that the mechanical treatments have effectively reduced spread or eradicated many of the small sites. Because weed seeds remain viable for many years, monitoring weed sites will be required for several growing seasons, and will determine the extent of follow-up treatments.

11. Coordination of this project with other related project(s) on adjacent lands?

X Yes No **If yes, then describe** (max. 10 lines)

In order to be successful, all the potential cooperators need to work together to prevent any treated areas from becoming reinfested. Existing coordination is by verbal agreement with adjacent land owners and Grant County Weed Department; landowners are informed of infestations adjacent to their lands, and sites observed on private lands adjacent to national forest are documented and shared with the County. Site specific cooperation is recorded in the weed database at the district, and will be monitored as part of this project. In the case of larger infestations, which threaten to cross boundaries, cooperative agreements will be drawn up in order to treat both private and public lands.

12. How does proposed project meet purposes of the Legislation? [Sec. 203(b)(1)]

Improves maintenance of existing infrastructure. [Sec. 2(b)]

X Implements stewardship objectives that enhance forest ecosystems. [Sec. 2(b)]

X Restores and improves land health. [Sec. 2(b)]

X Restores water quality. [Sec. 2(b)]

13. Project Type (check one) [Sec. 203(b)(1)]

☐ Road Maintenance [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]

☐ Trail Maintenance [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]

☐ Road Decommission/Obliteration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]

☐ Trail Obliteration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]

Other Infrastructure Maintenance (specify): [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]

☐ Soil Productivity Improvement [Sec. 2(b)(2)(B)]

☐ Forest Health Improvement [Sec. 2(b)(2)(C)]

Watershed Restoration & Mntc. [Sec. 2(b)(2)(D)]

☐ Wildlife Habitat Restoration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)]

☐ Fish Habitat Restoration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)]

☒ Control of Noxious Weeds [Sec. 2(b)(2)(F)]

☐ Reestablish Native Species [Sec. 2(b)(2)(G)]

☐ Other Project Type (specify) [Sec. 2(b)(2)]:

14. Measure of Project Accomplishments/Expected Outcomes [Sec. 203(b)(5)]

a. Total Acres: approximately 1000 sites or 150 acres/year treated, additional sites evaluated, mapped as new infestations are located.

b. Total Miles:

c. No. Structures:

e. No. Laborer Days: 310	d. Est. People Reached (for environmental education projects):
f. Other (specify):	

15. Estimated Completion Date: [Sec. 203(b)(2)] September 30, 2005

16. Target Species Benefited: (if applicable) (max. 7 lines)

All Native plant and animal species will benefit in addition to domestic plants and animals that use the forest and adjacent lands.

17. How will cooperative relationships among people that use federal lands be improved? [Sec. 2(b)(3)] (max. 12 lines)

This project addresses the growing public concern over noxious weed infestations. The project also improves ecosystem health and resilience by reducing impacts to native vegetation which provides better forage for wildlife and livestock, better soil holding abilities, and better aesthetics for recreation touring and wildflower viewing, thus enhancing tourism.

18. How is this project in the best public interest? [Sec. 203(b)(7)] **Identify benefits to communities.** (max. 12 lines)

This project will help ensure the success of weed control efforts taken on private lands in the vicinity, including agriculture croplands. Cooperative weed control reduces the spread of weeds back forth between public and private lands. The project also improves ecosystem health and resilience by reducing impacts to native vegetation which provides better forage for wildlife and livestock, better soil holding abilities, and better aesthetics for recreation touring and wildflower viewing, thus enhancing tourism.

19. How does project benefit federal lands/resources? (max. 12 lines).

All Native plant and animal species will benefit in addition to domestic plants and animals that use the forest and adjacent lands.

20. Status of Project Planning			
a. NEPA Complete:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
c. NMFS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
d. USFWS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
e. Survey & Manage Complete:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
f. DSL/ODFW* Permits for In-stream Work Obtained:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
g. DSL/COE* 404 Fill/Removal Permit Obtained:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
h. SHPO* Concurrence Received:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
i. Project Design(s) Completed:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
* DSL = Dept. of State Lands, ODFW = Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife, COE = Army Corps of Engineers, SHPO = State Historic Preservation Officer			

21. Proposed Method(s) of Accomplishment (<i>check those that apply</i>)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Contract	<input type="checkbox"/> Federal Workforce
<input type="checkbox"/> County Workforce	<input type="checkbox"/> Volunteers
X Other (specify): Mix of local labor through OYCC, job orders or contract, and federal workforce	

22. Will the Project Generate Merchantable Materials? [Sec. 204(e)(3)]

☐ Yes X No

23. Anticipated Project Costs [Sec. 203(b)(3)]	
a. Total County Title II Funds Requested: \$97,800	
b. Is this a multi-year funding request? X Yes No If yes, then display by fiscal year	
c. FY02 Request: \$	f. FY05 Request: \$ 32,600.
d. FY03 Request: \$	g. FY06 Request: \$ 35,200.
e. FY04 Request: \$30,000	

Table 1. Project Cost Analysis

Item	Column A Fed. Agency Appropriated Contribution [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	Column B Requested County Title II Contribution [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	Column C Other Contributions [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	Column D Total Available Funds
24. Field Work & Site Surveys*	\$3,800	\$3,300.		\$7,100.
25. NEPA & Sec. 7 ESA Consultation				
26. Permit Acquisition				
27. Project Design & Engineering				
28. Contract Preparation				
29. Contract Administration				
30. Contract Cost				
31. Workforce Cost *	\$8,200	\$17,300.		\$25,500.
32. Materials & Supplies	\$2,000	\$300.		\$2,300.
33. Monitoring*	\$3,800	\$3,200.		\$7,000.
34. Other (vehicles & mileage)	\$2,000	\$3,600.		\$5,600.
35. Project Sub-Total	\$19,800	\$27,700.		\$47,500.
36. Indirect Costs (Overhead @ 8% per year for multi-year projects)	\$5,188	\$2,216. (\$29,916)		\$7,404
37. Total Cost Estimate	\$24,988	\$30,000.		\$54,988

* 250 labor days at GS-3, 30 labor days at GS-7 rates

38. Identify Source(s) of Other Funding for Project Identified Above [Sec. 203(b)(4)] (max. 7 lines)

In-kind contributions of labor have been available in the past using Youth Conservation Corp workers, volunteer labor, Department of Corrections work crews and stand-by fire crews. Utilizing these sources will reduce labor cost.

39. Monitoring Plan [Sec. 203(b)(6)]

- a. **What measures or evaluations will be made to determine how well the proposed project meets the desired ecological conditions?** [Sec. 203(b)(6)] (max. 7 lines)

Who is responsible for this monitoring item?: A district range technician will check each treated site after treatment for effectiveness. A follow up inspection the next growing season after treatment will determine if further treatments are necessary. Records of treatments and site characteristics will be entered in the district data base.

- b. **How will the project be evaluated to determine how well the proposed project contributes towards local employment and/or training opportunities, including summer youth jobs programs such as the Youth Conservation Corps?** [Sec. 203(b)(6)] (max. 7 lines)

Who is responsible for this monitoring item?: The project sponsor or COR will determine the most cost effective strategy to initiate the project using the local labor pool available at the time. Local temporary work force and youth crews will be considered high priority.

- c. **What methods and measures of evaluation will be established to determine how well the proposed project improves the use of, or added value to, any products removed from National Forest System lands consistent with the purposes of this Act?** [Sec. 203(b)(6) and Sec. 204(e)(3)] (max. 7 lines)

Who is responsible for this monitoring item?: Not applicable

- d. **Identify total funding needed to carry out specified monitoring tasks (Table 1, Item 33)** (max. 7 lines)

Amount \$3800 per year for a GS-7 range technician to visit treated sites and record information.

Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000
Public Law 106-393
Title II Project Submission Form
Northeast Oregon Forests Resource Advisory
Committee

Project Name: Malheur North End Noxious Weed Treatment
GR-MAL04-100

County Court Concurrence

This proposed Public Law 106-393 project to be presented to the Northeast Oregon Forest Resource Advisory Committee has been reviewed by the Grant County Court (or representative thereof). This County Court agrees with the proposal as submitted, except for the comments noted below:

Attested by County Judge

Date

Priority Rating:

X High ☐ Medium ☐ Low

Comments/Rational: